

To: StClair, Christie[StClair.Christie@epa.gov]
From: Ethan Barton
Sent: Wed 4/13/2016 3:55:43 PM
Subject: Re: Superfund and Gold King Mine

Yes, as mentioned in my first email, my deadline for the Gold King Mine questions is end of business today and my deadline for the superfund questions is end of business tomorrow.

On Wed, Apr 13, 2016 at 11:51 AM, StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Should have asked if you have a deadline for this.

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: [202-564-2880](tel:202-564-2880)

m: [202-768-5780](tel:202-768-5780)

From: Ethan Barton [mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 10:25 AM
To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Superfund and Gold King Mine

Thanks.

On Wed, Apr 13, 2016 at 10:22 AM, StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Okay

Christie St. Clair

U.S. EPA Office of Media Relations

c: 202-768-5780

On Apr 13, 2016, at 10:20 AM, Ethan Barton <ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org> wrote:

Just wanted to clarify my question on superfund.

I'd like to know:

How the EPA improved efficiency regarding the "transaction costs" for lawyer and consultant fees mentioned in the article, which says such fees accounted for 1/4 of Superfund spending;

How the EPA improved cost-efficiency regarding how "slightly contaminated soil that might have been paved over or otherwise quarantined at modest cost has been dug up and incinerated at great cost."

How the EPA ensures "interminable litigation" no longer "delays action."

I'm looking for specific improvements or comments that explain why such improvements were unnecessary.

I'd also like a response to how the Times said Superfund "failed the performance test" by only cleaning 217 sites, and how that number has only risen to 391 after 22 years.

Thanks,

Ethan

On Wed, Apr 13, 2016 at 10:06 AM, Ethan Barton
ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org wrote:

Hi Christie,

I'm working on another Gold King Mine story and a separate Superfund story. I'm on deadline for the Gold King Mine story for end of business today and the Superfund story for tomorrow by end of business.

Gold King Mine:

I understand that part of the monitoring plan at the Animas River involves monitoring contaminant levels during storms events.

1. Does this monitoring also include the San Juan River?
2. Does the EPA have a plan to protect human and wildlife health if that monitoring shows spiked contaminant levels during storm events?
2. How long will it take to complete cleaning at the Bonita Pike Mining District and how much will it cost? Additionally, what are the time and cost estimates to finish cleaning just Gold King Mine and the Animas River?

For Superfund:

The New York Times wrote an editorial in 1994 calling Superfund a complete failure, and highlighted the low number of sites cleaned up (then 217), inefficiency, and cost-ineffectiveness, as well as the "interminable litigation that delays action."

(<http://www.nytimes.com/1994/02/07/opinion/not-so-super-superfund.html?scp=2&sq=superfund%20reagan&st=cse>)

How has the EPA made improvements in these areas 22 years later, especially considering the relatively few additional deletions since that editorial (174 more)?

Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarity for on any of these.

Thanks,

Ethan

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton
Investigative Reporter
Daily Caller News Foundation
410-829-1738
@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton
Investigative Reporter
Daily Caller News Foundation
410-829-1738
@ethanrbarton

--
Ethan Barton
Investigative Reporter
Daily Caller News Foundation
410-829-1738
@ethanrbarton